REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks in response to the Final Office Action dated May 1, 2007 (hereinafter the "Office Action").

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 24 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. **Claims 1** and **11** stand rejected as "it is not clear how a buffer can be sent to another process, as normally data is transferred form a buffer, but not the buffer itself". *See Office Action, Page 2*. However, the Applicant has amended these claims, support for which may be found throughout the specification and drawings, an example of which is found in paragraph [0043] of pages 16 and 17. The amendment of claim 1 recites "when the buffer delay time is reached, making the data in the buffer available to the second process by passing control of the buffer to the second process without communicating the data by the first process". Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 2, 13, 24 and 33, claims 2, 24 and 33 have been amended to recite an order, and thus are believed to overcome the rejection. It is respectfully submitted that claim 13 already recites an order and is thus definite.

With respect to claims 2, 13, 24 and 33, the Office asserts that "the term 'approximately full' in claims 2, 13, 24, and 33, is a relative term that renders the

claim indefinite". *See Office Action, Page 2.* With respect to claims 4, 14, 25 and 35, the office asserts that "the term 'approximately double' in claims 4, 14, 25, and 35, is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite". *See Office Action, Page 3.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in order to expedite prosecution these claims have been amended to remove the term "approximately". Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§§ 102(e) and 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 6-9, 10-12, 17-20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 32, 38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0216155 to Kobayashi (hereinafter "Kobayashi").

Claims 2, 13 24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0060272 to Mantey et al. (hereinafter "Mantey").

Claims 3, 4, 14, 22, 25, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623,483 to Agawal et al (hereinafter "Agawal").

Claims 5, 16, 27 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to Kobayashi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,057 to Baba et al (hereinafter "Baba").

Claims 15, 28 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0219014 to Kotabe et al (hereinafter "Kotabe").

Claims 29, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,096,472 to Machida et al (hereinafter "Machida"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a method comprising:

- determining an amount of time to communicate a message and receive a response to the message by a first process respectively to and from a second process;
- computing a buffer delay time from the amount of time;
- storing data from the first process in a buffer; and
- when the buffer delay time is reached, ***making the data in*** the buffer ***available*** to the second process ***by passing control of the buffer to the second process without communicating the data by the first process***.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed, an example of which may be found at paragraph [0043] of pages 16 and 17. It is respectfully asserted that the submitted references do not teach this feature. For example, the Office asserts that "control over data

passed with sending of data, paragraph 30 [of Kobayashi]". However, as recited in claim 1, control is passed without passing the data itself. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. These claims are also allowable based on their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a method comprising:

- sending a message from a first process addressed to a second process;
- receiving, at the first process, a response to the message sent from the second process to the first process;
- computing a buffer delay time as a factor of the time between the communicating and the receiving; and
- making data from the first process that is stored in the buffer available to the second process when the buffer delay time is reached ***by passing control of the buffer from the first process to the second process without communicating the data by the first process***.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed, an example of which may be found at paragraph [0043] of pages 16 and 17. It is respectfully asserted that the submitted references

do not teach or suggest this feature. For example, the Office asserts that "control over data passed with sending of data, paragraph 30 [of Kobayashi]". However, as recited in the above claim, control is passed without passing the data itself. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. These claims are also allowable based on their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a client comprising:

- a processor; and
- memory configured to maintain:
- one or more programs that are executable on the processor to provide respective one or more processes to process data;
- a buffer that is suitable to store said data;
- a buffer delay time; and
- an InterProcess Control (IPC) manager that is executable on the processor to:
- compute the buffer delay time from an amount of time taken to receive a response to a message by one said process from another said process; and

- manage the buffer such that when the buffer delay time is reached, data stored in the buffer from the one said process is made available to the other said process ***by passing control of the buffer from the one said process to the other said process without communicating the data by the one said process***.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed, an example of which may be found at paragraph [0043] of pages 16 and 17. It is respectfully asserted that the submitted references do not teach or suggest this feature. For example, the Office asserts that "control over data passed with sending of data, paragraph 30 [of Kobayashi]". However, as recited in the above claim, control is passed without passing the data itself. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-29 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. These claims are also allowable based on their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 30 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a system comprising:

- a first process for outputting data;
- a second process for processing the data to produce a response;
- a buffer for storing the data ***that is shared by the first process and the second process***;

- a buffer delay time computed from an amount of time taken to perform the outputting and to receive the response by the first process; and
- an IPC manager for managing the buffer such that when the buffer delay time is reached, another said data stored in the buffer is accessible by the second process.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed, an example of which may be found at paragraph [0043] of pages 16 and 17. It is respectfully asserted that the submitted references do not teach or suggest this feature. For example, the Office asserts that "control over data passed with sending of data, paragraph 30 [of Kobayashi]". However, as recited in the above claim, control is passed without passing the data itself. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-37 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. These claims are also allowable based on their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 38 has been amended, and as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics below) recites a system comprising:

- means for providing data;
- means for processing the data to produce a response for receipt by the providing means;

- means for storing the data;
- means for computing a delay time ***that is double*** an amount of time taken to perform the outputting and to receive the response by the providing means; and
- means for managing the storing means such that when the delay time is reached, another said data stored in the storing means is accessible by the processing means.

Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed, an example of which may be found in originally filed claims 4, 14, 25 and 35. It is respectfully asserted that the submitted references do not teach or suggest this feature. For example, the Office asserts that "it is obvious to double the amount of buffer time as two is a low multiple to use for timing systems like that of Agrawal's". *See Office Action, Page 9*. However, the Office gives no reasoning as to why this is obvious, for instance, if a low multiple is good, then why even use a multiple? Further, where does Agrawal or any of the other submitted references supply such motivation for the modification? Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 39-40 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 38 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim. These claims are also allowable based on their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Application is in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2007

By: /William J. Breen, III, #45,313/
William J. Breen, III
Reg. No. 45,313
509.755.7253